arXiv:1605.04835v2 [cs.FL] 17 Sep 2016

On the Gap Between Separating Words and Separating Their Reversals

Farzam Ebrahimnejad*

Department of Computer Engineering,
Sharif University of Technology

Abstract

The function $\mathrm{sep}(w, x)$ is defined as the size of the smallest deterministic finite automaton that accepts w and rejects x. It has remained unsolved until now that whether the difference $\left|\mathrm{sep}(w, x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R, x^R)\right|$ is bounded or not. In this paper, we prove by construction that this difference is unbounded.

Keywords: Words separation; Finite automata

1 Introduction

Definition 1. We say a deterministic finite automaton (DFA) D *separates* two distinct words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$, if it accepts w but rejects x. Furthermore, we let $\mathrm{sep}(w, x)$ be the minimum number of states required for a DFA to separates w and x.

In 1986, Goralcik and Koubek [3] introduced the separating words problem. This problem asks for good upper and lower bounds on

$$S(n) \coloneqq \max_{w \neq x \wedge |w|, |x| \leq n} \mathrm{sep}(w, x).$$

Goralcik and Koubek [3] proved $S(n) = o(n)$. Besides, the best known upper bound so far is $O(n^{2/5} (\log n)^{3/5})$, which was obtained by Robson [7, 8]. A recent paper by Demaine, Eisenstat, Shallit, and Wilson [1] surveys the latest results about this problem, and while proving several new theorems, it also introduces three new open problems, all of which have remained unsolved until now. In this paper, we solve the first open problem stated in that paper, which asks whether

$$\left|\mathrm{sep}(w, x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R, x^R)\right|$$

*Email address: febrahimnejad@ce.sharif.edu

is bounded or not. We prove that this difference is actually unbounded. In order to do so, in Theorem 31, for all positive integers $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we will construct two words

$$w = u0^n v, x = u0^{n+(2n+1)!}v,$$

for some $u, v \in \{ 01, 11 \}^+ \left(0^+ \{ 01, 11 \}^+\right)^*$, such that $\text{sep}(w, x) - \text{sep}(w^R, x^R)$ approaches infinity as k approaches infinity. As we will later see in Lemma 30, under certain conditions, we can set u, v so that it requires relatively few states to separate w^R, x^R. But while preserving these conditions, by using Lemma 15 and the regular language G_k, which we will later introduce, we set u, v so that it will require exponentially more states, with respect to k, to separate w and x. We will see how exactly to do so in the rest of the paper.

2 Results

2.1 Preliminaries

We assume the reader is familiar with the basic concepts and terminology of automata theory as in, for example, [4]. In this subsection, we present some definitions and notation, and prove a few simple lemmas which will be used in the subsequent subsections.

In this paper, we assume $\Sigma = \{ 0, 1, 2 \}$, unless stated otherwise explicitly. We also let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of natural numbers, excluding 0.

Definition 2. Assume D is a DFA, L is a regular language, $w \in \Sigma^*$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

- We denote the set of states of D by Q_D.
- We define M_i to be the set of all DFAs E, where $|Q_E| \leq i$. Clearly, M_i is a finite set.
- For a state $q \in Q_D$, we define $\delta_D(q, w)$ to be the state in Q_D at which we end if we start reading w from q. Also, assuming the start state of D is $q_0 \in Q_D$, we define $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(q_0, w)$. Moreover, for a subset of states $S \subseteq Q_D$ and a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we define

$$\delta_D(S, L) \coloneqq \left\{ q' \in Q_D \mid \exists q \in S, x \in L : q' = \delta_D(q, x) \right\}.$$

In this paper, for convenience, we will use subscript i instead of D_i. For example, we will write δ_i instead of δ_{D_i}.

Definition 3. We say a DFA D *distinguishes* two words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$ if $\delta_D(w) \neq \delta_D(x)$.

Lemma 4. *For any two arbitrary words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$ and any natural number $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some DFA $D \in M_p$ that distinguishes w and x, if and only if some DFA $D' \in M_p$ separates w, x.*

Proof. If some DFA D distinguishes two words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$, then the DFA with the same set of states and transition function as D, but with $\delta_D(w)$ as the only accepting state separates w, x.

In addition, if D does not distinguish w and x then it either accepts or rejects both w and x. Therefore it does not separate w, x. □

Lemma 5. *Let D be a DFA and $w, w' \in \Sigma^*$. If $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(w')$, then for any arbitrary word $x \in \Sigma^*$, we have $\delta_D(wx) = \delta_D(w'x)$.*

Proof. We have

$$\delta_D(wx) = \delta_D(\delta_D(w), x) = \delta_D(\delta_D(w'), x) = \delta_D(w'x).$$

□

Lemma 6. *For any four words $w, x, u, v \in \Sigma^*$,*

$$\operatorname{sep}(uwv, uxv) \geq \operatorname{sep}(w, x).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5, if some DFA separates wv and xv, then it also separates w and x. Therefore it follows that $\operatorname{sep}(wv, xv) \geq \operatorname{sep}(w, x)$. Besides, if some DFA D separates uwv and uxv, then the DFA with the same set of states and transitions as D but with $\delta_D(u)$ as the start state separates wv, xv. Hence

$$\operatorname{sep}(uwv, uxv) \geq \operatorname{sep}(wv, xv) \geq \operatorname{sep}(w, x).$$

□

Lemma 7. *For a DFA D and two words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$, we have*

$$|\delta_D(Q_D, w)| \geq |\delta_D(Q_D, wx)|.$$

Proof. By definition, we have $\delta_D(Q_D, wx) = \delta_D(\delta_D(Q_D, w), x)$. Therefore it follows that $|\delta_D(Q_D, w)| \geq |\delta_D(Q_D, wx)|$. □

Lemma 8. *Let R be a regular language and $S \coloneqq R\,(0^+R)^*$. If $w \in S\,(0^+S)^*$, then $w \in R\,(0^+R)^*$.*

Proof. Suppose $w \in S\,(0^+S)^*$. Then, we have

$$w \in R\left(0^+R\right)^*\left(0^+R\left(0^+R\right)^*\right)^* = R\left(0^+R\right)^+.$$

□

Definition 9. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $f_n = 0^n, g_n = 0^{n+(2n+1)!}, h_n = 0^{(2n+1)!}$. Clearly, we have $g_n = f_n h_n$.

Definition 10. Assume D is a DFA. For a state $q \in Q_D$, we say q is in a *zero-cycle*, if there exists some positive number $i \in \mathbb{N}$ where $\delta_D(q, 0^i) = q$. We call the minimum such i the length of this cycle.

Also, for a natural number $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i)$ to be the set of states in $\delta_D(q, (\epsilon + 0)^i)$ which are not in a zero-cycle. We denote $\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, |Q_D|)$ by $\mathrm{zpath}_D(q)$.

Lemma 11. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D \in M_{2n+1}$. If a state $q \in Q_D$ is in a zero-cycle, then for all words $w \in \Sigma^*$, we have $\delta_D(q, h_n w) = \delta_D(q, w)$.*

Proof. If q is in a zero-cycle, then since the size of that cycle is at most $|Q_D| \leq 2n + 1$, it divides $(2n + 1)!$. Thus $\delta_D(q, h_n) = q$. Hence by Lemma 5, $\delta_D(q, w) = \delta_D(q, h_n w)$. □

2.2 The Function C_n

As a result of Lemma 11, we see that $\mathrm{sep}(f_n, g_n) \geq n + 2$. This follows because if some DFA D has less than $n + 2$ states, then $\delta_D(f_n)$ must be in a zero-cycle, and hence by Lemma 11 it cannot separate f_n and g_n. Furthermore, a simple $n+2$ state DFA that only accepts 0^n can separate f_n and g_n. Therefore we have $\mathrm{sep}(f_n, g_n) = n+2$. Besides, by Lemma 6, for any two words $u, v \in \Sigma^*$, we get $\mathrm{sep}(uf_n v, ug_n v) \geq n + 2$. In this subsection, we show that it is possible to choose u and v so that $\mathrm{sep}(uf_n v, ug_n v) \geq 2n + 2$.

Remark 12. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i) \subseteq \mathrm{zpath}_D(q)$, and hence $|\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i)| \leq |\mathrm{zpath}_D(q)|$. Moreover, by definition we have $|\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i)| \leq i + 1$.

Remark 13. If $\delta_D(q, 0^i)$ is in a zero-cycle, then for all $j > i$, $\delta_D(q, 0^j)$ is also in a zero-cycle. So if $\delta_D(q, 0^i)$ is not in a zero-cycle, then

$$|\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i)| = i + 1 \leq |Q_D|\,.$$

Lemma 14. *For all natural numbers $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$|\mathrm{zpath}_D(q)| = |\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i - 1)| + \left|\mathrm{zpath}_D(\delta_D(q, 0^i))\right|.$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\mathrm{zpath}_D(q) = \mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i - 1) \cup \mathrm{zpath}_D(\delta_D(q, 0^i)).$$

Therefore it suffices to prove

$$X \coloneqq \mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i - 1) \cap \mathrm{zpath}_D(\delta_D(q, 0^i)) = \emptyset.$$

Assume $X \neq \emptyset$. Thus some $r \in X$ exists. By definition, $0 \leq j \leq i-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq |Q_D|$ exist such that

$$\delta_D(q, 0^j) = r, \delta_D(\delta_D(q, 0^i), 0^k) = \delta_D(q, 0^{i+k}) = r.$$

But $i + k \geq i > j$, so r is in a zero-cycle. Hence by definition, r cannot be in either $\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, i-1)$ or $\mathrm{zpath}_D(\delta_D(q, 0^i))$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 15. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w_0 \in \Sigma^+$, there exists $w \in w_0(0^+w_0)^*$ such that $\mathrm{sep}(wf_nw, wg_nw) \geq 2n+2$. We denote the w corresponding to w_0 by $C_n(w_0)$.*

Proof. We always preserve the condition that $w_i \in w_0(0^+w_0)^*$. Obviously this condition holds for $i = 0$. Now we run the following algorithm iteratively, while increasing i by 1 at each step, starting from $i = 1$:

If there exists a DFA $D \in M_{2n+1}$ such that $\delta_D(v, 0^y w_{i-1}) = \delta_D(v', 0^y w_{i-1})$ for some distinct $v, v' \in \delta_D(Q_D, w_{i-1})$ and $y \in \mathbb{N}$, then we set $w_i = w_{i-1}0^y w_{i-1}$. Otherwise, we set $w_i = w_{i-1}$ and terminate. By the loop condition stated above, we have $w_{i-1} \in w_0(0^+w_0)^*$. Therefore by Lemma 8, $w_i \in w_0(0^+w_0)^*$ and hence the loop condition holds for w_i. Furthermore, by Lemma 5 if for two states $s, s' \in Q_D$ we have $\delta_D(s, w_{i-1}) = \delta_D(s', w_{i-1})$, then $\delta_D(s, w_i) = \delta_D(s', w_i)$. Thus by the choice of v and v', it follows that $|\delta_D(Q_D, w_i)| < |\delta_D(Q_D, w_{i-1})|$. Moreover, By Lemma 7, for all DFAs $E \in M_{2n+1}$, we have $|\delta_E(Q_E, w_i)| \leq |\delta_E(Q_E, w_{i-1})|$. Hence we can write

$$\sum_{E \in M_{2n+1}} |\delta_E(Q_E, w_i)| < \sum_{E \in M_{2n+1}} |\delta_E(Q_E, w_{i-1})|.$$

Thus $\sum_{E \in M_{2n+1}} |\delta_E(Q_E, w_i)|$ decreases by at least one in each step, and therefore, this algorithm terminates after a finite iterations. Suppose it terminates after l iterations. We set $w = w_l$.

Now we claim $\mathrm{sep}(wf_nw, wg_nw) \geq 2n+2$. We prove by backward induction on t that for $t \geq n$, no DFA in M_{2n+1} can distinguish $w0^tw$ and $w0^th_nw$. In other words, we will prove by induction on t that for all integers $t \geq n$ and DFAs $D \in M_{2n+1}$, and all states $q \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$, we have

$$\delta_D(q, 0^t w) = \delta_D(q, 0^t h_n w).$$

Base step: Consider $t \geq 2n+1$. For all states $q \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$, the state $q' = \delta_D(q, 0^t)$ must be in a zero-cycle because otherwise by Remark 13, we have

$$|Q_D| \geq |\mathrm{zpath}_D(q, t)| = t + 1 \geq 2n + 2,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore by Lemma 11, it follows that

$$\delta_D(q, 0^t w) = \delta_D(q', w) = \delta_D(q', h_n w) = \delta_D(q, 0^t h_n w).$$

Induction step: Consider $n \leq t < 2n+1$. By the induction hypothesis we know that the claim holds for all $t' > t$. Pick one of the states $q \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$ maximizing $|\text{zpath}_D(q)|$ amongst all members of $\delta_D(Q_D, w)$. First, we prove the claim for all $p \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$ where $p \neq q$. Let us write $p' = \delta_D(p, 0^t)$. If p' is in a zero-cycle, then by Lemma 11 we get $\delta_D(p, 0^t w) = \delta_D(p, 0^t h_n w)$. Otherwise, p' is not in a zero-cycle. Let us write

$$X = \text{zpath}_D(q, t), X' = \text{zpath}_D(q), Y = \text{zpath}_D(p, t), Y' = \text{zpath}_D(p).$$

By Remark 12 and Remark 13, we have $|Y'| \geq |Y| = t + 1$. Therefore by the choice of q, we have $|X'| \geq |Y'| \geq t + 1$.

Hence $\delta_D(q, 0^t) \in X'$, and so it is not in a zero-cycle. Thus, we have $|X| = t + 1$. If $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, then since $X, Y \subseteq Q_D$, we see that

$$|Q_D| \geq |X| + |Y| = (t + 1) + (t + 1) = 2t + 2 \geq 2n + 2,$$

which is a contradiction. So there exists $r \in X \cap Y$. Therefore, by definition, there exist $0 \leq a, b \leq t$ such that $\delta_D(q, 0^a) = \delta_D(p, 0^b) = r$. The state r is not in a zero-cycle because otherwise by Remark 13, p' should also be in a zero-cycle, which contradicts our assumption. Hence by Remark 13 and Lemma 14, we have

$$\left|X'\right| = |\text{zpath}_D(q, a - 1)| + |\text{zpath}_D(\delta_D(q, 0^a))| = a + |\text{zpath}_D(r)|\,,$$

and similarly, we get

$$\left|Y'\right| = b + |\text{zpath}_D(r)|\,.$$

So $|X'| - |Y'| = a - b$. But we have $|X'| \geq |Y'|$. Hence $a \geq b$.

Suppose $a = b$. Then $\delta_D(q, 0^a) = \delta_D(p, 0^a)$. So if $a = b = 0$, then it follows that $p = q$, which contradicts our assumption. Therefore $a = b > 0$. By Lemma 5, we have $\delta_D(q, 0^a w) = \delta_D(p, 0^a w)$. Hence the algorithm could not have terminated, which is a contradiction. Thus we have $a > b$. So by the induction hypothesis for $(a - b) + t > t$, we have

$$\delta_D(q, 0^{(a-b)+t} w) = \delta_D(q, 0^{(a-b)+t} h_n w).$$

But since $b \leq t$, we obtain

$$\delta_D(q, 0^{(a-b)+t}) = \delta_D(q, 0^a 0^{t-b}) = \delta_D(r, 0^{t-b}) = \delta_D(p, 0^b 0^{t-b}) = \delta_D(p, 0^t).$$

Thus by Lemma 5, we have

$$\delta_D(p, 0^t w) = \delta_D(q, 0^{(a-b)+t} w) = \delta_D(q, 0^{(a-b)+t} h_n w) = \delta_D(p, 0^t h_n w).$$

It only remains to prove the claim for q. Let us write $q' = \delta_D(q, 0^t)$. We also write

$$A = \delta_D\left(\delta_D(Q_D, w) - \{\, q \,\}, 0^t w\right)$$

and

$$B = \delta_D\left(\delta_D(Q_D, w) - \{\, q \,\}, 0^t h_n w\right).$$

We know for any two distinct states $s, s' \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$, we have

$$\delta_D(s, 0^t w) \neq \delta_D(s', 0^t w), \delta_D(s, 0^t h_n w) \neq \delta_D(s', 0^t h_n w),$$

because otherwise the algorithm could not have terminated, which is a contradiction. So $|A| = |B| = |\delta_D(Q_D, w)| - 1$. But we proved the induction step for all members of $\delta_D(Q_D, w)$ except q. Hence for all states $s \in \delta_D(Q_D, w) - \{\, q \,\}$ we have $\delta_D(s, 0^t w) = \delta_D(s, 0^t h_n w)$. Therefore $A = B$. Also, by definition, for any state $s \in Q_D$ and any arbitrary word $v \in \Sigma^*$, we have $\delta_D(s, vw) \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$. Thus $A, B \subseteq \delta_D(Q_D, w)$. Let us write $e = \delta_D(q, 0^t w)$ and $e' = \delta_D(q, 0^t h_n w)$. We have $e, e' \in \delta_D(Q_D, w)$. But since the algorithm has terminated, we get $e \notin A$ and $e' \notin B$. Consequently we have

$$e \in \delta_D(Q_D, w) - A, e' \in \delta_D(Q_D, w) - B = \delta_D(Q_D, w) - A.$$

But $A \subseteq \delta_D(Q_D, w)$, so

$$|\delta_D(Q_D, w) - A| = |\delta_D(Q_D, w)| - (|\delta_D(Q_D, w)| - 1) = 1.$$

Therefore $e = e'$ and the proof is complete. □

2.3 The Regular Language G_k

Definition 16. For a regular language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we define $\mathrm{sc}(L)$ to be the minimum number of states needed for a DFA to accept L. This concept has been studied for a long time; see, for example, [6, 10, 11].

In this subsection, we introduce the regular language $G_k \subseteq \{\, 1, 2 \,\}^*$, which has some interesting characteristics. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathrm{sc}(G_k^R) = O(k)$, but $\mathrm{sc}(G_k) \geq 2^k$. Languages like G_k, having low state complexity but with reversal having high state complexity, have been defined before [2, 5, 9] but are not quite appropriate for our purposes. As proven later in Lemma 22, there exists $z_k \in G_k$ such that if a DFA with less than 2^k states accepts z_k, then it should also accept a word in $\{\, 1, 2 \,\}^* - G_k$. This, together with Lemma 15, helps us construct the desired words in Theorem 31.

Definition 17. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} L_k \coloneqq & \left\{\, 1^{2i}2 \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \wedge i \leq k \,\right\} \\ & \cup \{\, 1^{i_1}21^{i_2}2 \cdots 21^{i_{s-1}}21^{i_s}2 \mid\ s, i_1, \ldots, i_s \in \mathbb{N} \\ & \qquad\qquad \wedge\, i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_s = 2k + 1 \\ & \qquad\qquad \wedge\, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{s-1} \equiv 0 \pmod 2 \,\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we define $G_k \coloneqq L_k^*$, and let $H_k = \{\, 1, 2 \,\}^* - G_k$.

Lemma 18. *For all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$, we have $u1^{2k+1}2v \in G_k$ if and only if $u, v \in G_k$.*

Proof. We can easily observe that if $x1^{2k+1}2y \in L_k$, then $x = y = \epsilon$. Thus it follows that if $u1^{2k+1}2v \in L_k^*$, then both u and v should also be in $G_k = L_k^*$.

For the other direction, obviously $1^{2k+1}2 \in L_k$. Therefore by definition, if $u, v \in G_k$ then $u1^{2k+1}2v \in G_k$. □

Lemma 19. *For all integers $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathrm{sc}(G_k) \geq 2^k$.*

Proof. Let E be the set of all positive even numbers less than $2k + 1$. We define a function $r : \mathbb{P}(E) \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

For the empty set, we define $r(\emptyset) \coloneqq \epsilon$. Now consider an arbitrary non-empty subset of E, such as

$$F = \{\, a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \,\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m$. We define

$$r(F) \coloneqq 1^{a_m - a_{m-1}} 2 1^{a_{m-1} - a_{m-2}} 2 \cdots 2 1^{a_2 - a_1} 2 1^{a_1} 2.$$

Let $1 \leq i < 2k+1$ be an odd number and $F \subseteq E$. We claim $r(F)1^i2 \in G_k$ if and only if $2k+1-i \in F$. If $w = r(F)1^i2 \in G_k$, then by definition, $x \in G_k$ and $y \in L_k$ exist such that $w = xy$. But i is an odd number and 1^i2 is a suffix of y. Therefore by definition, $1 \leq p \leq m$ and $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p \in \mathbb{N}$ exist such that

$$b_p + b_{p-1} + \cdots + b_1 + i = 2k + 1,$$

and

$$y = 1^{b_p} 2 1^{b_{p-1}} 2 \cdots 1^{b_1} 2 1^i 2.$$

It follows that

$$b_1 = a_1, b_2 = a_2 - a_1, \ldots, b_p = a_p - a_{p-1}.$$

Thus

$$a_p = b_1 + \cdots + b_p = 2k + 1 - i.$$

So $2k + 1 - i \in F$.

For the other direction, suppose $2k + 1 - i \in F$. Then $a_j \in F$ exists such that $a_j = 2k + 1 - i$. All members of F are even numbers. Hence, by definition we have

$$1^{a_m - a_{m-1}} 2, 1^{a_{m-1} - a_{m-2}} 2, \ldots, 1^{a_{j+1} - a_j} 2 \in L_k.$$

Moreover, we have

$$i + ((a_j - a_{j-1}) + \cdots + (a_2 - a_1) + a_1) = (2k + 1 - a_j) + a_j = 2k + 1.$$

Hence

$$1^{a_j - a_{j-1}} 2 \cdots 1^{a_2 - a_1} 2 1^{a_1} 2 1^i 2 \in L_k.$$

Therefore $r(F)1^i 2 \in G_k = L_k^*$.

Now let D be a DFA such that $L(D) = G_k$. We claim for any two non-equal subsets of E, say F and F', we have $\delta_D(r(F)) \neq \delta_D(r(F'))$. Otherwise, pick an arbitrary integer $c \in (F - F') \cup (F' - F)$. Let us write

$$u = r(F)1^{2k+1-c}2, v = r(F')1^{2k+1-c}2.$$

By Lemma 5, we have $\delta_D(u) = \delta_D(v)$. So D either accepts or rejects both u and v. Without loss of generality, suppose $c \in F - F'$. Therefore by the above claim, $u \in G_k$ but $v \notin G_k$. So $L(D) \neq G_k$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\delta_D \circ r$ is a one-to-one function, and thus $|Q_D| \geq |\mathbb{P}(E)| = 2^k$.

□

Lemma 20. *For all integers $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have* $\mathrm{sc}(G_k^R) \leq 5k + 3$.

Proof. It suffices to prove there exists a DFA $D \in M_{5k+3}$ such that $L(D) = G_k^R$. We define D as follows:

We set

$$Q_D = \left\{ p_0, \ldots, p_{2k+1}, r_2, \ldots, r_{2k+1}, r'_1, r'_3, \ldots, r'_{2k-1}, d \right\}.$$

Additionally, we specify the following rules for the transition function:

- For $0 \leq i \leq 2k$, we set $\delta_D(p_i, 1) = p_{i+1}$.
- For $2 \leq i \leq 2k$, we set $\delta_D(r_i, d) = r_{i+1}$.
- $\delta_D(p_0, 2) = \delta_D(p_{2k+1}, 1) = \delta_D(r_{2k+1}, 1) = \delta_D(d, 1) = \delta_D(d, 2) = d$.
- For $1 \leq i \leq k$, we set

  $$\delta_D(p_{2i}, 2) = p_0, \delta_D(p_{2i-1}, 2) = r'_{2i-1},$$

  and

  $$\delta_D(r'_{2i-1}, 2) = \delta_D(r_{2i}, 2) = d, \delta_D(r'_{2i-1}, 1) = r_{2i}.$$

- For $2 \leq i \leq k$, we set $\delta_D(r_{2i-1}, 2) = r'_{2i-1}$.
- $\delta_D(p_{2k+1}, 2) = \delta_D(r_{2k+1}, 2) = p_0$.

Finally, we set p_{2k+1} to be the start state, and

$$A = \{ p_2, p_4, \ldots, p_{2k}, p_{2k+1}, r_{2k+1} \}$$

to be the set of accept states.

It is not hard to verify that $\delta_D(A, L_k^R) \subseteq A$, and hence $\delta_D(A, \left(L_k^R\right)^*) = \delta_D(A, G_k^R) \subseteq A$. It is also easy to show that $\delta_D(A, \Sigma^* - G_k^R) \cap A = \emptyset$. Thus since $p_{2k+1} \in A$, we obtain $L(D) = G_k^R$. Therefore we have $\mathrm{sc}(G_k^R) \leq |Q_D| = 5k + 3$.

□



Figure 1: The DFA D which is explained in Lemma 20. The reject state d is not shown.

Definition 21. For $w \in \Sigma^*$ and a language L over Σ, we define $\mathrm{lsep}(w, L)$ as the minimum number of states of a DFA that accepts w and rejects all $x \in L$.

Lemma 22. *There exists* $z_k \in (G_k - \{\epsilon\})$ *such that* $\mathrm{lsep}(z_k, H_k) \geq 2^k$.

Proof. At the beginning, we set $w_0 = \epsilon$, $U_0 = M_{2^k-1}$ and $V_0 = \emptyset$. We preserve the following conditions for all $j \geq 0$:

1. $V_j \cup U_j = M_{2^k-1}$;
2. $w_j \in G_k$;
3. For all DFAs $D \in V_j$, there exists some $r \in H_k$ such that D does not distinguish r and w_j.

Obviously these conditions hold for $j = 0$. Let us define

$$\beta_D(i) \coloneqq \delta_D(w_i 1^{2k+1} 2).$$

Now we run the following algorithm iteratively, while increasing i by 1 at each step, starting with $i = 1$:

For a DFA D, let us write

$$X_D = \delta_D(\beta_D(i-1), G_k), Y_D = \delta_D(\beta_D(i-1), H_k).$$

In each iteration, if there does not exist a DFA $D_i \in U_{i-1}$ such that $X_i \cap Y_i \neq \emptyset$, then we terminate by setting $w_i = w_{i-1}$, $U_i = U_{i-1}$ and $V_i = V_{i-1}$.

Otherwise, let us pick an arbitrary state $q \in X_i \cap Y_i$. By definition, there exist some $x \in G_k$ and $y \in H_k$ such that $q = \delta_i(\beta_i(i-1), x) = \delta_i(\beta_i(i-1), y)$. We set $w_i = w_{i-1}1^{2k+1}2x$, $U_i = U_{i-1} - \{ D_i \}$ and $V_i = V_{i-1} \cup \{ D_i \}$. Obviously, Condition 1 holds for $j = i$. Moreover, by Condition 2 for $j = i-1$, we have $w_{i-1} \in G_k$. Therefore by Lemma 18, we have $w_i \in G_k$, and hence Condition 2 holds for $j = i$.

Furthermore, by Condition 3 for $j = i-1$, for all DFAs $F \in V_{i-1}$, there exists $r \in H_k$ such that $\delta_F(r) = \delta_F(w_{i-1})$. Hence by Lemma 5, we have

$$\delta_F(r1^{2k+1}2x) = \delta_F(w_{i-1}1^{2k+1}2x) = \delta_F(w_i).$$

But by Lemma 18, we obtain $r1^{2k+1}2x \in H_k$. Thus Condition 3 holds for all members of $V_{i-1} = V_i - \{ D_i \}$, for $j = i$. It only remains to prove that it also holds for D_i. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_i(w_i) = \delta_i(w_{i-1}1^{2k+1}2x) &= \delta_i(\beta_i(i-1), x) \\ &= \delta_i(\beta_i(i-1), y) = \delta_i(w_{i-1}1^{2k+1}2y).\end{aligned}$$

But by Lemma 18, we get $w_{i-1}1^{2k+1}2y \in H_k$. Hence Condition 3 holds for D_i. Therefore Condition 3 holds for $j = i$.

This algorithm terminates after a finite iterations because $|U_i|$ decreases by 1 at each step (except the last one). Suppose it terminates after l iterations. We claim $U_l = \emptyset$. Otherwise there exists some $E \in U_l$. Let E' be the DFA with the same set of states and transition function as E, but with $\beta_E(l-1)$ as the start state and with $\delta_E(\beta_E(l-1), G_k)$ as the set of accepting states. By definition, we have $G_k \subseteq L(E')$. Furthermore, E' cannot accept any word $w \notin G_k$ because otherwise

$$\delta_E(\beta_E(l-1), G_k) \cap \delta_E(\beta_E(l-1), H_k) \neq \emptyset,$$

and therefore the algorithm could not have terminated, which is a contradiction. Hence $L(E') = G_k$. So by Lemma 19 we have $E' \notin M_{2^k-1}$, which contradicts $|Q_{E'}| = |Q_E| \leq 2^k - 1$.

Thus by Condition 1 it follows that $V_l = M_{2^k-1}$. By Condition 3, for all DFAs $D \in M_{2^k-1}$, if D accepts w_l, then it also accepts some word in H_k. Hence we obtain $\mathrm{lsep}(w_l, H_k) \geq 2^k$. By Condition 2, we have $w_l \in G_k$. Furthermore, for $1 \leq i \leq l$, we have $w_i \neq \epsilon$. Hence $w_l \in (G_k - \{ \epsilon \})$. Therefore we can set $z_k \coloneqq w_l$. □

Definition 23. We let $H'_k = H_k \cup \{ z_k \}$.

Remark 24. For any two DFAs $D \in M_i$ and $D' \in M_j$, some DFA $E \in M_{i \times j}$ exists such that $L(E) = L(D) \cap L(D')$.

Lemma 25. *For any two DFAs $D, D' \in M_{2^{k/2}-1}$, there exists $w \in H_k$ such that $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(z_k)$ and $\delta_{D'}(w) = \delta_{D'}(z_k)$.*

Proof. Let E be the same DFA as D but with $\delta_D(z_k)$ as the only accept state. Similarly, let E' be the same DFA as D' but with $\delta_{D'}(z_k)$ as the only accept state. Obviously, $z_k \in L(E) \cap L(E')$. Let us write $X = L(E) \cap H_k$ and $Y = L(E') \cap H_k$.

By Lemma 22, we have $X, Y \neq \emptyset$. We claim $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, by Remark 24, some DFA F with at most

$$(2^{k/2} - 1)(2^{k/2} - 1) < 2^k$$

states exists such that $L(F) = L(E) \cap L(E')$. If $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, then we obtain $L(F) \cap H_k = \emptyset$. But $z_k \in L(F)$. Hence F accepts z_k but rejects all words in H_k, and therefore, by Lemma 22, we have $|Q_F| \geq 2^k$, which is a contradiction. Hence there exists

$$w \in X \cap Y = L(E) \cap L(E') \cap H_k.$$

Thus both E and E' accept $w \in H_k$. Furthermore, by the construction of the DFAs E and E', we obtain

$$\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(z_k), \delta_{D'}(w) = \delta_{D'}(z_k),$$

and therefore the proof is complete. □

Lemma 26. *Let $w \in H'_k\,(0^+H'_k)^*$. For any two DFAs $D, D' \in M_{2^{k/2}-1}$, there exists some $w' \in H_k\,(0^+H_k)^*$ such that $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(w')$ and $\delta_{D'}(w) = \delta_{D'}(w')$, or in other words, neither D nor D' distinguishes w and w'. We denote the w' corresponding to w by* $\mathrm{free}_{k,D,D'}(w)$.

Proof. Suppose $w \in H'_k\,(0^+H'_k)^*$. So it can be expressed as

$$w = u_1 0^{i_1} \cdots u_{l-1} 0^{i_{l-1}} u_l 0^{i_l} u_{l+1},$$

where $i_1, \ldots, i_l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_1, \ldots, u_{l+1} \in H'_k$. Let us write

$$w_j = u_1 0^{i_1} \cdots u_{j-1} 0^{i_{j-1}} u_j 0^{i_j}.$$

For convenience, we also set $i_0 = 0$ and $w_0 = \epsilon$. Now for $1 \leq i \leq l+1$, we define the words $u'_i \in H_k$ as follows: If $u_i \neq z_k$, then we set $u'_i = u_i$. Otherwise we have $u_i = z_k$. By Lemma 25, it follows that there exists $x \in H_k$ such that $\delta_D(w_{j-1}z_k) = \delta_D(w_{j-1}x)$ and $\delta_{D'}(w_{j-1}z_k) = \delta_{D'}(w_{j-1}x)$. We set $u'_i = x$. In either of the cases, clearly we have $u'_i \in H_k$.

Now let us write

$$w' = u'_1 0^{i_1} \cdots u'_l 0^{i_l} u'_{l+1}.$$

We claim $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(w')$ and $\delta_{D'}(w) = \delta_{D'}(w')$. Let us set $x_0 = x'_0 = \epsilon$. Moreover, for $1 \leq j \leq l+1$, we set

$$x_j = u_1 0^{i_1} \cdots u_{j-1} 0^{i_{j-1}} u_j,$$

and

$$x'_j = u'_1 0^{i_1} \cdots u'_{j-1} 0^{i_{j-1}} u'_j.$$

We prove by induction that for $0 \leq j \leq l+1$, we have $\delta_D(x_j) = \delta_D(x'_j)$ and $\delta_{D'}(x_j) = \delta_{D'}(x'_j)$. The base step is obvious for $j = 0$. For $j \geq 1$, if $u_j \neq z_k$, then we have $u'_j = u_j$ and by Lemma 5 we obtain the claim. Otherwise, by the induction hypothesis we have $\delta_D(x_{j-1}) = \delta_D(x'_{j-1})$. Hence by Lemma 5 we get

$$\delta_D(w_{j-1}) = \delta_D(x_{j-1} 0^{i_{j-1}}) = \delta_D(x'_{j-1} 0^{i_{j-1}}).$$

Therefore, by the choice of u'_{j-1} we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_D(x_j) = \delta_D(w_{j-1}u_j) &= \delta_D(w_{j-1}z_k) \\
= \delta_D(w_{j-1}u'_j) &= \delta_D(\delta_D(w_{j-1}), u'_j) \\
&= \delta_D(\delta_D(x'_{j-1}0^{i_{j-1}}), u'_j) \quad = \delta_D(x'_{j-1}0^{i_{j-1}}u'_j) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad = \delta_D(x'_j),
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof of the claim is complete. Similarly, we can prove $\delta_{D'}(x_j) = \delta_{D'}(x'_j)$ for all $0 \leq j \leq l+1$. Hence we obtain

$$\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(x_{l+1}) = \delta_D(x'_{l+1}) = \delta_D(w')$$

and

$$\delta_{D'}(w) = \delta_{D'}(x_{l+1}) = \delta_{D'}(x'_{l+1}) = \delta_{D'}(w')$$

Besides, for all $1 \leq j \leq l+1$, we have $u'_j \in H_k$. Therefore it follows that $w' \in H_k\,(0^+ H_k)^*$ and the proof is complete.

□

2.4 Mapping $\{\,0,1,2\,\}^*$ to $\{\,0,1\,\}^*$

The previous lemmas may help us to construct two words in $\Sigma^* = \{\,0,1,2\,\}^*$ with our desired characteristics. To be able to construct the intended words in an alphabet of size 2, in this subsection we introduce the function tl that maps words in Σ^* to words in $\{\,0,1\,\}^*$.

Definition 27. For a word $w \in \Sigma^*$, we define $\mathrm{tl}(w)$ to be the word obtained from w by replacing all occurrences of 1 by 11 and all occurrences of 2 by 01. Similarly, we define $\mathrm{tr}(w)$ to be the word obtained from w by replacing all occurrences of 1 by 11 and all occurrences of 2 by 10. Clearly we have $\mathrm{tl}(w), \mathrm{tr}(w) \in \{\,0,1\,\}^*$.

Remark 28. We have $\mathrm{tr}^R(w) = \mathrm{tl}(w^R)$ (or equivalently, $\mathrm{tr}(w) = \mathrm{tl}^R(w^R)$).

Lemma 29. *For all pairs of words $w, x \in \Sigma^*$, we have*

$$\mathrm{sep}(\mathrm{tl}(w), \mathrm{tl}(x)) \geq \mathrm{sep}(w, x).$$

Proof. Let D be a DFA that separates $\mathrm{tl}(w)$ and $\mathrm{tl}(x)$. We construct a new DFA E with $Q_E = Q_D$ that separates w and x. For all states $q \in Q_E$, we set

$$\delta_E(q,0) = \delta_D(q,0), \delta_E(q,1) = \delta_D(q,11), \delta_E(q,2) = \delta_D(q,01).$$

Finally, we set $\delta_E(w)$ to be the accept state of E. It is fairly easy to see that for all words $u \in \Sigma^*$, we have $\delta_E(u) = \delta_D(\mathrm{tl}(u))$. Therefore we have

$$\delta_E(w) = \delta_D(\mathrm{tl}(w)) \neq \delta_D(\mathrm{tl}(x)) = \delta_E(x).$$

Thus E separates w and x. □

Lemma 30. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \subseteq \{1,2\}^*$ be a regular language such that $\mathrm{sc}(R) \leq t$. Also, let $w \in ((\{1,2\}^* - R)\,0^+)^*\,(R - \{\epsilon\})$. Let us write $x = \mathrm{tr}(w)$. For all $w' \in 1\{0,1\}^*$, we have*

$$\mathrm{sep}(xf_nw', xg_nw') \leq 2t + n + 4.$$

Proof. We have $\mathrm{sc}(R) \leq t$. So there exists a DFA $D \in M_t$ such that $L(D) = R$. By using D, we construct another DFA $E \in M_{2t+n+4}$ that distinguishes xf_nw' and xg_nw'. Assume

$$Q_D = \{q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{m-1}\}$$

for some $m \leq t$, with q_0 being the start state of D. We then set

$$Q_E = Q_D \cup \{q'_0, q'_1, \ldots, q'_{m-1}, r_1, \ldots, r_n, r_{n+1}, s, p, p'\}.$$

We set s to be the start state of E. Now suppose A is the set of accepting states of D. We specify the following rules for the transition function of E:

- For $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, we set

$$\delta_E(q_i,1) = q'_i, \delta_E(q'_i,0) = \delta_D(q_i,2), \delta_E(q'_i,1) = \delta_D(q_i,1).$$

- For all $q_i \notin A$, we set $\delta_E(q_i,0) = s$.
- For all $q_i \in A$, we set $\delta_E(q_i,0) = r_1$.
- For $1 \leq i \leq n$, we set $\delta_E(r_i,0) = r_{i+1}$ and $\delta_E(r_i,1) = p$.
- $\delta_E(p,0) = \delta_E(p,1) = p$.
- $\delta_E(r_{n+1},0) = r_{n+1}$ and $\delta_E(r_{n+1},1) = \delta_E(p',0) = \delta_E(p',1) = p'$.
- $\delta_E(s,0) = s$ and $\delta_E(s,1) = q'_0$.



Figure 2: The DFA E, which is explained in Lemma 30 (assuming $q_{i+1}, \ldots, q_n$ are the only accept states in D).

Figure 2 represents the DFA E in case that q_0 is not an accepting state.

Clearly, for all $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, we have $\delta_E(q_i, 11) = \delta_D(q_i, 1)$ and $\delta_E(q_i, 10) = \delta_D(q_i, 2)$. Hence for all $u \in \{1, 2\}^*$, we have $\delta_E(\mathrm{tr}(u)) = \delta_D(u)$. Hence it is easy to prove that $\delta_E(x) \in A$, and therefore we can show that $\delta_E(xf_nw') = p$ and $\delta_E(xg_nw') = p'$. Thus E distinguishes xf_nw' and xg_nw'. So by Lemma 4 we get

$$\mathrm{sep}(xf_nw', xg_nw') \leq |Q_E| \leq 2t + n + 4.$$

□

2.5 The Main Result

Now we are ready to prove our main result. As shown in Theorem 32, by substituting the appropriate values for n and k in Theorem 31, we can prove that the difference $\left|\mathrm{sep}(w, x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R, x^R)\right|$ is unbounded.

Theorem 31. *For all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist two unequal words $w', x' \in \{0, 1\}^*$ such that*

$$\mathrm{sep}(w', x') \geq \min(2n + 2, 2^{k/2}),$$

but

$$\mathrm{sep}((w')^R, (x')^R) \leq n + 10k + 10.$$

Proof. Let us write $p = \min(2n+2, 2^{k/2}) - 1$. Consider an arbitrary ordering of all pairs of DFAs in M_p and each of their states:

$$(D_1, s_1), (D_2, s_2), \ldots, (D_m, s_m),$$

where $s_i \in Q_i$ and m is the total number of such pairs, which is clearly finite.

We start with

$$u_0 = v_0 = z_k, w_0 = u_0 f_n v_0 = z_k f_n z_k, x_0 = u_0 g_n v_0 = z_k g_n z_k.$$

We always preserve the following conditions for $0 \leq e \leq m$:

1. $u_e \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$.
2. $v_e \in z_k \left(0^+ H_k\right)^*$. We have $z_k \in H'_k$, so we get $v_e \in H'_k \left(0^+ H_k\right)^*$. Also, we have $H_k \subset H'_k$, and therefore we obtain $v_e \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$.
3. $w_e = u_e f_n v_e$ and $x_e = u_e g_n v_e$.
4. For all $1 \leq j \leq e$ and $\alpha, \alpha' \in \Sigma^*$, if $\delta_j(\alpha u_e) = s_j$, then $\delta_j(\alpha w_e \alpha') = \delta_j(\alpha x_e \alpha')$. By setting $\alpha = \alpha' = \epsilon$, it follows that if $\delta_j(u_e) = s_j$ then $\delta_j(w_e) = \delta_j(x_e)$.

We can easily observe that these conditions hold for $e = 0$. Now we run the following algorithm iteratively for $i = 1, 2, \ldots m$:

By Condition 3 for $e = i - 1$, we have $w_{i-1} = u_{i-1} f_n v_{i-1}$ and $x_{i-1} = u_{i-1} g_n v_{i-1}$. We set

$$u_i = C_n(v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1}).$$

By Lemma 15, we have

$$u_i \in v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} \left(0^+ v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1}\right)^*.$$

So it can be expressed as

$$u_i = v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} 0^{i_1} v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} 0^{i_2} \cdots v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} 0^{i_l} v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1},$$

for some $l, i_1, \ldots, i_l \in \mathbb{N}$.

By Conditions 1 and 2 for $e = i - 1$, we have $u_{i-1}, v_{i-1} \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$. Hence by Lemma 8, we have $v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$. Therefore by using Lemma 8 again, we get $u_i \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$. So Condition 1 holds for $e = i$.

Moreover, let us write

$$y = u_{i-1} 0^{i_1} v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} 0^{i_2} \cdots v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1} 0^{i_l} v_{i-1} 0 u_{i-1}.$$

Clearly, we have $u_i = v_{i-1} 0 y$. With the same argument as for u_i, by using Lemma 8 we can show that $y \in H'_k \left(0^+ H'_k\right)^*$. Let E be the DFA with the same set of states and transition function as D_i, but with $\delta_i(s_i, f_n v_{i-1} 0)$ as the start state, and similarly, let E' be the DFA with the same set of states and transition function as D_i, but with $\delta_i(s_i, g_n v_{i-1} 0)$ as the start state. We have $D_i \in M_p$, thus

$$|Q_E| = |Q_{E'}| = |Q_D| \leq p \leq 2^{k/2} - 1.$$

Therefore by Lemma 26, $y' \coloneqq \mathrm{free}_{k,E,E'}(y)$ exists. Now we set

$$v_i = v_{i-1}0y'.$$

By Condition 2 for $e = i-1$, we have $v_{i-1} \in z_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^*$. Furthermore, by Lemma 26, we have $y' \in H_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^*$. Thus we obtain

$$v_i \in z_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^* 0^+H_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^* = z_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^+ \subseteq z_k\left(0^+H_k\right)^*,$$

and therefore Condition 2 is satisfied for $e = i$.

Afterwards, we set $w_i \coloneqq u_i f_n v_i$ and $x_i \coloneqq u_i g_n v_i$. Hence Condition 3 holds for $e = i$.

By Lemma 26, we have

$$\delta_E(y) = \delta_E(y'), \delta_{E'}(y) = \delta_{E'}(y').$$

But by the definition of E and E', for any arbitrary word $c \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$\delta_E(c) = \delta_i(s_i, f_n v_{i-1}0c), \delta_{E'}(c) = \delta_i(s_i, g_n v_{i-1}0c).$$

By using the last four equalities, we obtain

$$\delta_i(s_i, f_n v_{i-1}0y) = \delta_E(y) = \delta_E(y') = \delta_i(s_i, f_n v_{i-1}0y')$$

and

$$\delta_i(s_i, g_n v_{i-1}0y) = \delta_{E'}(y) = \delta_{E'}(y') = \delta_i(s_i, g_n v_{i-1}0y').$$

By substituting $u_i = v_{i-1}0y$ and $v_i = v_{i-1}0y'$, we get

$$\delta_i(s_i, f_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, f_n v_i), \delta_i(s_i, g_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, g_n v_i).$$

Now consider an arbitrary word $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$. Suppose $\delta_i(\alpha u_i) = s_i$. Hence we get

$$\delta_i(\alpha u_i f_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, f_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, f_n v_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i f_n v_i),$$

and similarly,

$$\delta_i(\alpha u_i g_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, g_n u_i) = \delta_i(s_i, g_n v_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i g_n v_i).$$

Besides, we have $u_i = C_n(v_{i-1}0u_{i-1})$. So by Lemma 15, we have $\mathrm{sep}(u_i f_n u_i, u_i g_n u_i) \geq 2n+2$. Hence by Lemma 6, we get

$$\mathrm{sep}(\alpha u_i f_n u_i, \alpha u_i g_n u_i) \geq \mathrm{sep}(u_i f_n u_i, u_i g_n u_i) \geq 2n+2.$$

We have $D_i \in M_p$. Therefore $|Q_i| \leq p \leq 2n+1$, and thus, D_i cannot separate $\alpha u_i f_n u_i$ and $\alpha u_i g_n u_i$. Hence by Lemma 4, we have

$$\delta_i(\alpha u_i f_n u_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i g_n u_i).$$

Therefore we can conclude that if $\delta_i(\alpha u_i) = s_i$, then we have

$$\delta_i(\alpha u_i f_n v_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i f_n u_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i g_n u_i) = \delta_i(\alpha u_i g_n v_i).$$

By substituting $w_i = u_i f_n v_i$ and $x_i = u_i g_n v_i$, we obtain $\delta_i(\alpha w_i) = \delta_i(\alpha x_i)$. Furthermore, by Lemma 5, it follows that for any word $\alpha' \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$\delta_i(\alpha w_i \alpha') = \delta_i(\alpha x_i \alpha').$$

Thus Condition 4 is satisfied when $e = j = i$. Moreover, we have $u_i \in \Sigma^* u_{i-1}$ and $v_i \in v_{i-1}\Sigma^*$. So there exist $b, b' \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u_i = bu_{i-1}$ and $v_i = v_{i-1}b'$. Hence we can write

$$w_i = u_i f_n v_i = bu_{i-1} f_n v_{i-1} b' = bw_{i-1}b',$$

and similarly, we have

$$x_i = u_i g_n v_i = bu_{i-1} g_n v_{i-1} b' = bx_{i-1}b'.$$

Thus for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$\alpha w_i \alpha' = \alpha b w_{i-1} b' \alpha', \alpha x_i \alpha' = \alpha b x_{i-1} b' \alpha'.$$

Now let us write $\beta = \alpha b$ and $\beta' = b'\alpha'$. Suppose $1 \leq j \leq i-1$. By Condition 4 for $e = i-1$, if

$$\delta_j(\beta u_{i-1}) = \delta_j(\alpha b u_{i-1}) = \delta_j(\alpha u_i) = s_j,$$

then $\delta_j(\beta w_{i-1}\beta') = \delta_j(\beta x_{i-1}\beta')$. By replacing β and β' we get $\delta_j(\alpha w_i \alpha') = \delta_j(\alpha x_i \alpha')$. So Condition 4 for $e = i$ is also satisfied when $j \leq i-1$. Therefore Condition 4 holds for $e = i$. Hence we proved that all four conditions are satisfied for $e = i$.

In the end, we set $u = u_m, v = v_m, w = w_m$ and $x = x_m$. We claim $\mathrm{sep}(w, x) \geq p + 1$. Otherwise, suppose $D \in M_p$ separates w, x. So by Lemma 4 D distinguishes w and x. Let us write $s = \delta_D(u)$. We have $|Q_D| \leq p$. Therefore by definition, there exists $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $D_i = D$ and $s_i = s$. Since $\delta_D(u) = s$, by Condition 4 for $e = m$ and $j = i$, we have $\delta_D(w) = \delta_D(x)$, which contradicts the assumption that D separates w and x. Therefore $\mathrm{sep}(w, x) \geq p + 1$. Now we set $w' = \mathrm{tl}(w)$ and $x' = \mathrm{tl}(x)$. By Lemma 29, we have

$$\mathrm{sep}(w', x') \geq \mathrm{sep}(w, x) \geq p + 1 = \min(2n + 2, 2^{k/2}).$$

Besides, we have $w^R = v^R f_n u^R$ and $x^R = v^R g_n u^R$. By Condition 2, we have $v \in z_k \left(0^+ H_k\right)^*$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} v^R \in \left(H_k^R 0^+\right)^* z_k^R &= \left(\left(\{\,1,2\,\}^* - G_k^R\right) 0^+\right)^* z_k^R \\ &\subseteq \left(\left(\{\,1,2\,\}^* - G_k^R\right) 0^+\right)^* (G_k^R - \{\,\epsilon\,\}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 20, we have $\mathrm{sc}(G_k^R) \leq 5k+3$. Moreover, by Condition 2 we obtain $u^R \in \{1,2\}\Sigma^*$. Therefore by definition, we obtain $\mathrm{tr}(u^R) \in 1\Sigma^*$. Hence by Remark 28 and Lemma 30, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sep}((w')^R,(x')^R) &= \mathrm{sep}(\mathrm{tl}^R(w),\mathrm{tl}^R(x)) \\
&= \mathrm{sep}(\mathrm{tr}(w^R),\mathrm{tr}(x^R)) \\
&= \mathrm{sep}(\mathrm{tr}(v^R f_n u^R),\mathrm{tr}(v^R g_n u^R)) && \leq 2(5k+3)+n+4 \\
& && = 10k+n+10.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 32. *The difference*

$$\left|\mathrm{sep}(w,x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R,x^R)\right|$$

is unbounded for an alphabet of size at least 2*.*

Proof. Let $\{0,1\} \subseteq \Sigma$ and $k \in N$. If we set $n = 2^{k/2-1}-1$, then by Theorem 31, there exist $w,x \in \Sigma^*$ such that

$$\mathrm{sep}(w,x) \geq \min(2n+2, 2^{k/2}) = 2^{k/2},$$

and

$$\mathrm{sep}(w^R,x^R) \leq n+10k+10 = (2^{k/2-1}-1)+10k+10.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sep}(w,x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R,x^R) &\geq 2^{k/2} - \left(2^{k/2-1}+10k+9\right) \\
&= 2^{k/2-1} - 10k - 9,
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to infinity as k approaches infinity. □

3 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we proved that the difference $\left|\mathrm{sep}(w,x) - \mathrm{sep}(w^R,x^R)\right|$ can be unbounded. However, it remains open to determine whether there is a good upper bound on $\mathrm{sep}(w,x)/\mathrm{sep}(w^R,x^R)$.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Jeffrey Shallit, Mohammad Izadi, Arseny Shur, Mohammad-Taghi Hajiaghayi, Keivan Alizadeh, Hooman Hashemi, Hadi Khodabandeh and Mobin Yahyazadeh who helped me write this paper.

References

[1] Erik D. Demaine, Sarah Eisenstat, Jeffrey Shallit, and David A. Wilson. Remarks on separating words. In *Descriptional Complexity of Formal Systems - 13th International Workshop, DCFS 2011, Gießen/Limburg, Germany, July 25-27, 2011. Proceedings*, pages 147–157, 2011.

[2] Yuan Gao, Lila Kari, and Sheng Yu. State complexity of union and intersection of square and reversal on k regular languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 454:164–171, 2012.

[3] Pavel Goralcik and Václav Koubek. On discerning words by automata. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 13th International Colloquium, ICALP86, Rennes, France, July 15-19, 1986, Proceedings*, pages 116–122, 1986.

[4] John E. Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation - (2. ed.)*. Addison-Wesley series in computer science. Addison-Wesley-Longman, 2001. ISBN 978-0-201-44124-6.

[5] Galina Jirásková. On the state complexity of complements, stars, and reversals of regular languages. In *Developments in Language Theory, 12th International Conference, DLT 2008, Kyoto, Japan, September 16-19, 2008. Proceedings*, pages 431–442, 2008.

[6] A. N. Maslov. Estimates of the number of states of finite automata. In *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, volume 11, pages 1373–1375, 1970.

[7] John M. Robson. Separating strings with small automata. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 30(4):209–214, 1989.

[8] John M. Robson. Separating words with machines and groups. *ITA*, 30(1):81–86, 1996.

[9] Juraj Sebej. Reversal of regular languages and state complexity. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Theory and Practice of Information Technologies, ITAT 2010, Hotel Smrekovica, Veľká Fatra, Slovak Republic, September 21-25, 2010*, pages 47–54, 2010.

[10] Sheng Yu, Qingyu Zhuang, and Kai Salomaa. Obtaining tight upper bounds for the state complexities of DFA operations. In *Computing and Information - ICCI'92, Fourth International Conference on Computing and Information, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, May 28-30, 1992, Proceedings*, pages 100–104, 1992.

[11] Sheng Yu, Qingyu Zhuang, and Kai Salomaa. The state complexities of some basic operations on regular languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 125(2):315–328, 1994.